



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mf

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,078	02/20/2004	Ronald D. Smith	ITL.0225C1US (P7133C)	7006
21906	7590	09/08/2006	EXAMINER	
TROP PRUNER & HU, PC 1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750 HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631			AGGARWAL, YOGESH K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
DATE MAILED: 09/08/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/784,078	Applicant(s) SMITH ET AL.	
	Examiner Yogesh K. Aggarwal	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-22, 24, 25 and 27-32 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 19-22, 24, 25 and 27-31 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 12, 14-18 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. See MPEP 2106, the following is under the heading “Nonstatutory Subject Matter”.

(a) Functional Descriptive Material: “Data Structures” Representing Descriptive Material *Per Se* or Computer Programs Representing Computer Listings *Per Se*

Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material *per se* and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure *per se* held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional inter-relationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure’s functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 12, 15, 16, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (USPN 6,205,244 to Bawolek et al) in view of (USPN 6,542,185 to Bogardus).

[Claim 12]

Art Unit: 2622

Bawolek et al, herein Bawolek, discloses an article comprising a medium for storing instructions that, if executed, enable a processor-based system to:

sequentially illuminating a plurality of lights arranged circumferentially, each of a different wavelength (e.g., Fig. 3 and step 42 of Fig. 4; step 82 of Fig. 82);

measure the ambient white light intensity of each of said lights in response to a request for calibration (e.g., steps 42 and 43 of Fig. 4; steps 82 and 83 of Fig. 8; Examiner notes that each color represents a portion of the white light spectrum wherein the ambient white light intensity, namely the ambient light generated by the illuminated LED's, is measured); and

calibrate said digital camera for the ambient lighting conditions using said measurements (e.g., the image sensor is calibrated to the ambient conditions present in the calibration device; step 44 of Fig. 4; steps 84-86 of Fig. 8). Note that the claimed "medium for storing instructions that cause a processor-based system to" work is an inherent part of a camera.

Bawolek does not disclose how calibration is initiated. Bogardus teaches to implement calibration upon input from an input device from the user (e.g., column 2, lines 43-49). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added an input device to Bawolek's invention in order to all a user control over when the calibration should take place.

In regards to claim 15 note column 4, lines 19-21 and Fig. 3.

In regards to claim 16 Bawolek does not disclose nor preclude using pattern recognition techniques. Bogardus discloses using image recognition to determine the locations of each of the color patches so as to extract the color data from the center of that region and use it to calibrate the camera (column 4, line 55 – column 5, line 30). Therefore it would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 2622

of ordinary skill in the art to have added image recognition to Bawolek's invention so as to enable determining the location of each of the light sources for extracting data corresponding to that location for use in calibrating the camera.

In regards to claim 32 see Examiner's notes on the rejection of claim 12.

4. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (USPN 6,205,244 to Bawolek et al) in view of (USPN 6,542,185 to Bogardus) in view of (USPN 5,119,178 to Sakata et al).

[Claim 14]

Bawolek does not disclose nor preclude measuring the ambient white light intensity is implemented automatically in response to the detection of a change in ambient light conditions.

It is well known in the art to measuring the ambient white light intensity automatically in response to the detection of a change in ambient light conditions as taught by Sakata et al, herein Sakata. Sakata discloses adjusting for ambient lighting conditions by using a white balance circuit wherein the white balancing is automatically preformed for different lighting conditions so as to provide an optimum white balance (column 3, lines 15-19).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have preformed the calibration automatically so as to maintain an optimum white balance.

5. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (USPN 6,205,244 to Bawolek et al) in view of (USPN 6,542,185 to Bogardus) in view of (USPN 5,852,675 to Matsuo et al).

[Claim 17]

Art Unit: 2622

Bawolek does not disclose nor preclude including identifying indicia on the external device.

Matsuo discloses including indicia on the external device so as to correlate the optical characteristics of the external device with pre-stored information about the external device (e.g., column 9, lines 5-13). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added identification indicia on the external device so as to load the proper pre-stored information for the external device.

In regards to claim 18 see examiners notes on the rejection of claim 17. Note that the external device in Matsuo is optically coupled to the camera.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-11, 19-22, 24, 25, 27-31 are deemed allowable over the prior art of record, the reasons for allowance are as follows:

In regards to claims 19-22, 24, 25, and 27-30 23 the prior art of record does not disclose nor fairly suggest a portable device for calibrating a digital camera for varying ambient light conditions as claimed in claim 19 wherein the housing includes two slidably connecting housing portions, one of the portions including a white surface and the other of the portions including the control circuit, a battery, and the light emitting elements and wherein claims 20-22, 25, and 27-30 depend from claim 19 or 24.

In regards to claim 1 the prior art of record does not disclose nor fairly suggest a method of calibrating a digital camera including a plurality of light emitting elements arranged circumferentially about a white light transmissive plate. Claims 2-11 and 31 depend from claim 1.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Parvulescu et al. (US Patent # 6,404,984)
- b. Nagaoka et al. (US Patent # 4,954,861).
- c. Lungershausen et al. (US Patent # 5,701,015)
- d. Kakiuchi et al. (US Patent # 6,734,450)
- e. Yamamori (US Patent # 5,142,359).
- f. Shipp (US PG-PUB 2003/0035048).
- g. Forkey (US Patent # 5,733,246).
- h. Olczak et al. (US Patent # 6,275,256).
- i. Simerly (US Patent # 5,982,424).
- j. Netzer (US Patent # 5,930,383).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yogesh K. Aggarwal whose telephone number is (571) 272-7360. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571)-272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

YKA
August 3, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vivek Srivastava', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER